1 2

3

4

5

67

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

2425

26

2728

Page - 1

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

ANDRA M. HAGINS,

Petitioner,

v.

JOHN GAY, WARDEN,

Respondent.

Case No. C06-5676FDB-KLS

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO DENY APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS

Noted for December 29, 2006

This case has been referred to Magistrate Judge Karen L. Strombom pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local MJR 3 and 4. Petitioner is an inmate at the Florence Correctional Center, located in Florence, Arizona. He filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Dkt. #2), but has paid the \$5.00 Court filing fee. Accordingly, the Court should deny the application.

## DISCUSSION

A district court may permit indigent litigants to proceed *in forma pauperis* upon completion of a proper affidavit of indigency. <u>See</u> 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). However, the court has broad discretion in denying an application to proceed in forma pauperis. <u>Weller v. Dickson</u>, 314 F.2d 598 (9th Cir. 1963), *cert. denied*, 375 U.S. 845 (1963).

On November 20, 2006, the Clerk received petitioner's petition (Dkt. #1) and his application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (Dkt. #2). On the same day, the Court's records show petitioner paid the \$5.00 Court filing fee. Because he has paid the filing fee, petitioner's application to proceed *in forma* 

pauperis is therefore moot.

## **CONCLUSION**

Because petitioner has paid the Court filing fee, the undersigned recommends that the Court deny his application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("Fed. R. Civ. P."), petitioner shall have ten (10) days from service of this Report and Recommendation to file written objections thereto. See also Fed. R. Civ. P. 6. Failure to file objections will result in a waiver of those objections for purposes of appeal. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Accommodating the time limit imposed by Rule 72(b), the clerk is directed set this matter for consideration on **December 29, 2005**, as noted in the caption.

DATED this 5th day of December, 2006.

Karen L. Strombom

United States Magistrate Judge